

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-27 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 10-18 and 22-27 were amended. No claims were added or canceled. This application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, and reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following comments.

### **I. 35 U.S.C. § 101**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In rejecting claims 1-27, the Examiner states that the claims are not covered by the statutory categories of patentable subject matter because “the claim language simply represents an abstract idea where a set of returned documents are compared and then based on the comparison a determination is made as to how the fields are mapped to adapters, but fails to provide a useful, concrete, and tangible purpose or result.” The Examiner further states that “[i]n order to overcome this rejection, the applicant must add a final limitation to independent claims 1, 11, 17, and 27 showing step of actually presenting the field mappings to a user in the form of a view.”

In response, claim 1 has been amended to positively recite the step of “presenting documentation of the field mappings to an operator”, and independent claims 11, 17 and 27 have been amended in a similar manner. This language is fully supported in the specification and in original dependent claims 10 and 26; and, as recognized by the Examiner, ensures that the claims provide a useful, concrete and tangible result that fully satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101.

With respect to claim 27, the Examiner states that the claim additionally fails to satisfy 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed computer readable medium is not limited to physical articles or objects. In order to expedite prosecution, claim 27 has been further amended to recite a “recordable-type computer readable medium. This language is fully supported and defined on page 21, lines 27-29 of the specification as comprising physical storage media and fully satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Therefore, the rejection of claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 has been overcome.

### **II. 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In rejecting the claims, the Examiner states:

As to claim 1, the preamble states "testing an integration model" but the rest of the preamble recites mapping generic and application specific objects. It is unclear to the examiner how mapping relates to testing and therefore renders the claim indefinite. Claim 1 also recites the term "adapter(s)" but it is unclear to the examiner as to what exactly constitutes an adapter(s) and therefore renders the claim indefinite. In order to overcome this rejection, applicant needs to clarify the mapping and testing relationship with respect to objects and also clarify exactly what the applicant constitutes as an adapter(s).

Office Action dated November 3, 2006, page 4.

In response, the preamble of claim 1 has been amended to recite that the invention is directed to a "method for mapping between a generic object model and application specific object models of applications in an integration model having mapping logic", and independent claims 11, 17 and 27 have been amended in a similar manner. This language clarifies the invention recited in the claims and avoids any possible confusion regarding the term "testing."

In addition, claims 1, 17 and 27 have been amended to recite that the adapters recited therein provide connections to applications. It should be noted that claim 11 has not been amended in this regard inasmuch as it already recites that the apparatus recited therein has a plurality of spokes and that each spoke has an adapter for connecting an application to a hub.

Yet further, dependent claims 10 and 26 have been amended to reflect amendments made in claims 1 and 17, respectively, and claims 12-16, 18 and 22-26 have been amended to correct inadvertent errors in their dependency.

In view of all the above amendments, claims 1-27 are clear and definite throughout and fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Therefore the rejection of claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph has been overcome.

### **III. Conclusion**

The Examiner states that claims 1-27 would be allowable if amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. In view of the above amendments, this application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the Examiner so find and Issue a Notice of Allowance in due course.

The Examiner is urged to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner further amendment of claims is needed to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

DATE: February 5, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Gerald H. Glanzman/

Gerald H. Glanzman  
Reg. No. 25,035  
Yee & Associates, P.C.  
P.O. Box 802333  
Dallas, TX 75380  
(972) 385-8777  
Attorney for Applicants